



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MARSIGLIO OF PADUA AND WILLIAM OF OCKAM

I.

THE study of the political writings of the Middle Ages has gone on so rapidly since the appearance of Friedberg's *Die mittelalterlichen Lehren über das Verhältniss von Staat und Kirche*,¹ in 1869, and of Riezler's *Die literarischen Widersacher der Päpste zur Zeit Ludwig des Baiers*,² in 1874, that the complaint of Lorenz³ that this literature has not been sufficiently investigated by capable men is coming to have less and less force. Not only have the political and ecclesiastical theories of the mediæval writers begun to be studied,⁴ but their influence on each other has been taken up with considerable energy. Their ideas, which arose from the desire to define the relations between church and state, continued to influence the theoretical writers on those institutions even when the heated controversies about their relative powers had ceased because of the tacitly understood supremacy of the state. It is with this fact in his mind that Albert, in his article on Matthias Döring in the *Historisches Jahrbuch*,⁵ says that "to trace the influence of the controversial literature of the time of Louis of Bavaria on the succeeding century would be a very useful undertaking." To go farther and trace the influence of the theorists of the conciliar movement of the fifteenth century on the reformers of the next century, of these on Althusius and Grotius, of these in turn on Hobbes and his contemporaries, and of these in their turn on Montesquieu and others of the eighteenth century, would prove yet more useful and far more interesting.

Work in this line on the period between 1300 and 1350 has already been done by Riezler. His book, however, was undertaken from the standpoint of the church and thus leaves much to be done from the point of view of political theories. Janet in his *Histoire de la Science Politique*,⁶ and Franck in his *Les Réformateurs et Publicistes*,⁷ pretend to give the political theories of the Middle

¹ *Zeitschrift f. Kirchenrecht*, ed. Dove and Friedberg, VIII. 69-137.

² Leipzig.

³ *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, 3d ed. (1887), II. 333.

⁴ Gierke, *Genossenschaftsrecht*, 1881, III. 502-644.

⁵ XI. 489.

⁶ Paris, 1887, 3d ed.

⁷ Paris, 1884.

Ages, but they can hardly be said to have treated this period seriously or scientifically. Even Riezler's work, a fine example of historical research for the period which it covers, has become more or less antiquated through the discovery of new facts in recent researches upon the authors and writings studied by him. This is especially true of the two most important writers with whom he deals—the Italian, Marsiglio of Padua, and the Englishman, William of Ockam.

The family name of Marsiglio, which Riezler on insufficient grounds had put as Raimondini,¹ seems certainly to have been Maynardino. His rectorship at the University of Paris, so often mentioned, can not have begun before September 14, 1312, nor have extended beyond May 5, 1313, while there is a strong probability that it began December 16, 1312, and ended March 19, 1313.² The length of time during which he was in Paris before he was made rector cannot be ascertained with any certainty.³ It is very probable that he was there several years beforehand, though it may have been less than one year.⁴ After his rectorship he probably stayed at the university in the position of a teacher.⁵ By a bull of October 14, 1316,

¹ Riezler, o. c., p. 30, accepted this name on the authority of Alberto Mussato in his *Ludovicus Bavarus* (in Boehmer's *Fontes*, I. 175), notwithstanding that all the other sources had given his family name as Maynardino or some form of that name. On the strength of two recently discovered letters of Pope John XXII. (in *Vatikanische Akten z. deut. Gesch. in der Zeit Ludwigs des Bayern*, ed. Riezler, Innsbruck, 1891, pp. 5, 66), he decides in favor of Maynardino. This explains the title of Menandrinus given to Marsiglio. Variations in the name, such as Mainardini, Marquardino, etc., are such as occur in all names at that time, e. g., Ockam, Jandum, Niem, etc.

² By the regulations in force at this time the election of rector took place four times a year (H. Denifle, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, Paris, 1894, I. 576, II. 455). By referring to the calendar (*ibid.*, II. 709–716), and to Giry, *Manuel de Diplomatique*, Paris, 1894, it is an easy matter to calculate that the elections took place October 10 and December 16, 1312, and March 19 and June 22, 1313. For the quarter preceding October 10, 1312, we find Hermerigus rector (Denifle, II. 156). For the following quarter we have no evidence, while for the quarter between December 16, 1312, and March 19, 1313, we find Marsiglio rector (*ibid.*, 157). For the quarter between March 19 and June 22, 1313, we find a certain Nicolaus rector (*ibid.*, 169). These regulations were not always strictly adhered to. There was a reenactment of them under Marsiglio.

³ Riezler, o. c., 34, thinks it was long.

⁴ To be chosen rector at that time it was necessary to be a member of the Faculty of Arts, engaged in teaching (Denifle, I. xxvi.). This implied the degree of Master of Arts taken at the University, but to get this degree did not require any specified time of residence at the University (Bulæus, *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis*, IV. 272 ff.). Its recipient merely had to swear that he was graduated from a university having at least twelve teachers and that he had studied arts during six years (Thurot, *L'Enseignement dans l'Université de Paris au Moyen Âge*, Paris, 1850). The importance of the office (Denifle, I. 576, II. 455), makes it exceedingly unlikely that Marsiglio would have been made rector after a few years' residence.

⁵ Additional proof of his teaching at Paris is furnished by his friend and coadjutor John of Jandum in a preface written by him in a copy of Peter of Abano's commentaries on the *Problemata Aristotelis*, which belonged to Marsiglio. The seeming original of this

he was made a canon of the church of Padua by Pope John XXII.,¹ and it is probable that he went to Padua at this time.² On April 5, 1318,³ he was given by the same pope the right to the presentation to an ecclesiastical benefice of the bishopric of Padua. These grants⁴ by John prove beyond a doubt that Marsiglio was a member of the secular clergy.⁵ At some time in his life he made a visit to Rome, or Avignon, where he saw the terrible corruption of the Roman curia.⁶ It appears that he became a bachelor or master in theology at Paris and gave lectures on theology, but this is not certain. That he was a physician and practised at Paris there is no doubt,⁷ but at what time and where he took his degree in medicine remain uncertain.⁸

He began his famous *Defensor Pacis* about the end of April,

is in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal at Paris (MS. Latin. Cod. 723), and comes from the library of the College of Navarre, of which Jandum was a student and afterwards teacher in 1315. (Le Roux de Lincy et Tisserand, *Paris et ses Historiens*, Paris, 1867, p. 5.) After speaking of his beloved master, Marsiglio of Padua, Jandum says that he was the first among the masters teaching philosophy at Paris to receive instruction in this subject from Marsiglio.

¹ *Vatikan. Akten*, No. 6.

² Lorenz, o. c., II. 348, thinks that he did.

³ *Vat. Akten*, No. 100.

⁴ Denifle, o. c., II. 158, 171, denies the statements of A. Thomas, *Extraits des Archives du Vatican pour servir à l'Histoire du Moyen Âge in Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'École de Rome*, 1882, pp. 446-452, and of Riezler that these grants have reference to the great Marsiglio of Padua. His grounds for denial are: (1) among the executors of the bull of October 14th there is not one who lived at Paris, where Marsiglio was at that time; (2) the name is spelled Maynardino in 1316 and Marquardino in 1318; (3) he is not called "Magister." To these objections it may be said that the fact that the continuator of William of Nangis (ed. Géraud, II. 14.) says, that Marsiglio and Jandum left Paris in 1318, is no evidence that they were there in 1316. The difference in spelling is no weighty argument when we consider the numerous ways of spelling all proper names at this time. In the bulls which we shall mention further on we shall find that Marsiglio's title of "Magister" is often omitted. On the other hand, the name Maynardino coincides with those given by the other authorities (*supra*), the letter of 1316 calls him "natus Bonmatthei," while Mussato calls his father "Mattheo," and John XXII. in a bull of April 9, 1327 (Martène et Durand, *Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum*, II. 692), says that "Marsiglio and Jandum, unmindful of and ungrateful for the benefices they have received, have adhered to Louis of Bavaria," and John therefore deprives them of their "ecclesiastical benefices and dignities." In connection with this it should be said that Jandum had been made canon of Senlis, November 13, 1316 (Thomas, l. c.). This explains what was not clear to Le Roux de Lincy (o. c., pp. 74, 78), why Jandum withdrew to Senlis in 1323 to finish his *De Laudibus Parisius*.

⁵ Evidence as to his being a regular clergyman is untrustworthy (Riezler, p. 34).

⁶ *Defensor Pacis* in M. Goldast, *Monarchia S. R. Imp.*, II. 274, line 44. The statement (Lorenz II. 348), that he was at Avignon cannot be drawn from this.

⁷ Examinations of Franciscus of Venice before the inquisition court at Avignon in Baluze, *Miscellanea*, ed. Mansi, Lucca, 1761, II. 280. Inquisition on Marsiglio's book, Denifle, III. 221-227.

⁸ Thomas's (l. c.) attempt to fix the time when he took his degree is far from convincing.

1324, and finished it June 24th of the same year.¹ The part that John of Jandum took in the composition of the book cannot be determined, though to all appearances it was small.² Shortly afterwards the two, probably at the invitation of Louis of Bavaria, went to his court, then at Nuremberg.³ With this emperor Marsiglio remained until his death, which occurred in 1342 or before April in 1343.⁴

No critical study of the manuscripts or the editions of the *Defensor Pacis* has yet been made. Besides the manuscripts mentioned by Riezler,⁵ there are six at Paris,⁶ one at Auxerre,⁷ one at London,⁸ one at Cambridge,⁹ one at Oxford,¹⁰ and three at Vienna.¹¹ Adding to these the five that Riezler gives we have eighteen manuscript copies of this work. To these we may add another in the form of an Italian translation,¹² making in all nineteen—a number which makes Riezler's remarks about the scarcity of manuscript copies valueless.¹³ The number of manuscripts is about equalled by the nu-

¹ Riezler (pp. 195 ff.) puts the limits within which the work was written too far apart. C. Müller (*Der Kampf Ludwigs des Bayern mit der römischen Kurie*, 1879-80, I. 368) discovered a manuscript in Vienna which enabled him to fix the above limits. Ritter (in *Hist. Zeitschrift*, XLII. 302) on insufficient grounds rejects Müller's conclusions. As the same writer refused to accept the limits set by Riezler (Reusch, *Theolog. Literaturblatt*, 1874, No. 24) it is difficult to see what kind of proof he wants.

² Riezler, *ibid.* Riezler is inclined to overemphasize the unity of the work. A comparison of a manuscript of the *Defensor Pacis* at Vienna, which is supposed to be the original, with Jandum's (more properly Genduno; Le Roux de Lincy, p. 20) handwriting in *De Laudibus Parisius* might inform us whether Jandum was the copyist of Marsiglio, as Friedberg (o. c., p. 114) thinks he was.

³ *Cont. of Nangis*. Riezler wrongly says that they were first condemned by the pope in 1327, and on this ground doubts that they were in Germany as early as 1324, though there is much evidence to show that they were. See below.

⁴ Riezler, pp. 38 and 122. Scheffer-Boichorst convinced Riezler (*Jenae Literaturzeitung*, 1874, No. 43, p. 674; *Hist. Zeitschrift*, 1878, II. p. 328) that Marsiglio did write the tract on divorce in 1342. Riezler would thus contract his old limits of October 28, 1336—April 10, 1343, for Marsiglio's death. Wurm in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, 1893, XIV. 68-69, accepts Riezler's old limits. On what grounds it is difficult to see.

⁵ Pp. 193, 194: (1) Vienna, Haus-, Hof- und Staats-archiv, Codex 768; 14th century MS.; (2) Vienna, Hofbibliothek or Bibliotheca Palatina, Cod. 464, cent. 14; (3) Rome, Vatican, Cod. 3974; (4) Oxford, Magdalen Coll., Cod. 86, cent. 14 (Riezler translates Wadding's abbreviation of Coll. Mag. wrongly); (5) Turin, Royal Library, Cod. 1416.

⁶ In Bibliothèque Nat., MSS. Latin: (6) Cod. 1778, 16, cent. 14; (7) Cod. 15690, cent. 14; (8) Cod. 15869, cent. 14; (9) Cod. 14503, cent. 14; (10) Cod. 14619, cent. 15; (11) 14620, cent. 15. No. 6 comes from the Colbert Library, Nos. 7 and 8 from the Sorbonne, the last three from the Abbey of St. Victor.

⁷ Bibliothèque de la Ville: (12) Cod. 19, cent. 14.

⁸ British Mus. in MSS. of King's Library (ex Aedibus Jacobeis): (13) Cod. 10 A, XV., cent. 14.

⁹ Library of Caius College: (14) Cod. 16.

¹⁰ Bodleian Lib.: (15) Cod. 188, cent. 15.

¹¹ Bibl. Palat.: (16) Cod. 809, cent. 14; (17) Cod. 4516, cent. 15; (18) Cod. 5369, cent. 15.

¹² Florence, Bibliotheca Laurentiana: Cod. 26, cent. 15.

¹³ O. c., pp. 173, 193. Müller in the *Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen* for 1883, Vol. II.,

merous editions of the book published in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, all of which are mentioned by Riezler.¹

The other works of Marsiglio, the *De Translatione Imperii*,² probably written in 1325 or 1326,³ and the *Tractatus Consultationis super Divortio Matrimonii*,⁴ written in 1342, are of small importance and add little or nothing to the political theories which he had already expressed in the *Defensor Pacis*.⁵

In turning to the life and works of Ockam we find that little has been discovered since the appearance of Riezler's work.⁶ Mr. R. L. Poole, in his admirable biography of Ockam written in 1895 for the *Dictionary of National Biography*, has summed up most of the results of recent research on his life, and Mr. A. G. Little has made a partial study of the manuscripts and editions of his works.⁷ Of his writings a very large number deal with subjects in logic, philosophy and religious doctrine. The remainder are devoted to attacks on the papacy, and though mainly theological are partly taken up with the exposition of his political ideas. The first of his anti-papal writings appeared very probably in 1330, at the latest in 1332.⁸ This was his celebrated *Opus nonaginta Dierum*.⁹ This was followed by *Tractatus*

says there is a manuscript of the *Defensor* in Munich, but he is mistaken. There is a manuscript copy (17 cent.) of the 1522 edition in Hanover.

¹ Pp. 193, 194. In his enumeration here he does not mention the edition by Goldast, Hanover, 1613, in Vol. III. of his *Monarchiae S. Rom. Imp.*, nor the two reprints of this at Frankfort in 1621 and 1668, in which the third volume is called Vol. II. It is extremely doubtful whether the edition of Frankfort, 1492, mentioned by A. Hurant (*Thèse sur Marsile de Padoue*, Paris, 1892, p. 22, n. 1), ever existed. It is also mentioned by B. Labanca, *Marsilio da Padova*, Padua, 1882, p. 112. Müller, in *Gött. Gelehrte Anzeigen*, o. c., p. 921 n., says that this is merely the edition of 1592. Similarly doubtful is the edition of 1515, mentioned by P. J. Lelong (*Bibliothèque de la France*, Paris ed., 1768-78, I. 475), under the title of *Opus Insigne*, said to be in fol. Lelong has probably confused this with the edition of 1622.

² Goldast, II. 147-153.

³ Riezler, p. 173.

⁴ Goldast, II. 1386; Riezler, 234. For further MSS. and editions of this and the preceding work see Potthast, *Bibl. Hist. Med. Aevi*.

⁵ Marsiglio is said to have been the author of some philosophical works. However true this may be, there is a manuscript in the Library of St. Mark, Venice (MS. Latin., Cod. 219) of the *De Reactione* of John of Marliano, in which he argues against the philosophical and other opinions of a certain Marsilius of Padua and others. In the library of Vendôme in France there is a MS. by a certain "Marsilius Paduensis," Magister, and Peter of Tusignana; MS. Latin., Cod. 245. In a manuscript of the Bodleian Library, Cod. 188, there is a work called the *Defensor minor editus a magistro Marsilio Paduano post Defensorem majorem*. It is a manuscript of the 15th century, is bound with the original *Defensor Pacis* and Marsiglio's *De Translatione Imperii*, and begins, "Quoniam autem in prioribus recitavimus," etc.

⁶ Pp. 241-272.

⁷ *The Grey Friars in Oxford*, Oxford, 1892, pp. 225-234. Space prevents me from making corrections and additions on Ockam's life and works.

⁸ Riezler, p. 243.

⁹ Goldast, II. 993-1236.

*de Dogmatibus Johannis XXII. Papæ*¹ in 1333 or 1334;² *Epistola ad Fratres Minores in capitulo apud Assisim congregatos* in 1334;³ *Opusculum adversus Errores Johannis XXII.* in 1335;⁴ *Compendium Errorum Johannis XXII. Papæ* between 1335 and 1338;⁵ *Tractatus ostendens quod Benedictus papa. XII. nonnullas Johannis XXII. Hæreses amplexus est et defendit* about 1338;⁶ *Tractatus de Potestate Imperiali* after 1339;⁷ *Super Potestate summi Pontificis octo Quæstionum Decisiones* between 1339 and 1342;⁸ *Tractatus de Jurisdictione Imperatoris in Causis matrimonialibus* in 1342;⁹ *Dialogus* in 1342 or 1343;¹ and *De Electione Caroli IV.* at the beginning of 1348.¹¹

Ockam's polemical activity was thus confined between the years 1330 and 1349,¹² and all his works on the church and the state appeared some time after the *Defensor Pacis*. Notwithstanding this fact all of the writers on Marsiglio and Ockam have up to this time declared that the former was very much influenced by the latter in his ideas of church and state.

As to the extent of this influence the various authorities differ. Riezler (p. 35) says that according to Clement VI. "it was Ockam, who was yet teaching in Paris, who exercised such a deep influence on the mind of his Italian colleague." Further on (p. 241), after remarking on the statement of Clement VI. in 1343 that Marsiglio had taken his heretical views from Ockam, he proceeds to speculate as to where this influence had been exercised. Rejecting Munich because Marsiglio had already written his *Defensor Pacis* before he met Ockam there, he decides that Ockam must have met Marsiglio

¹ Ibid., 740-770, thus a part of his *Dialogus*.

² Riezler, p. 244.

³ MS. Lat. 3387, fols. 262-265, Bib. Nat. Paris. Selections are published by Müller in the *Ztschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, 1884, VI. 108-112.

⁴ No edition; MS. Latin, 3387, fols. 175-214, Bibl. Nat., Paris.

⁵ Goldast, II. 957-976; Riezler, 245.

⁶ No edition; MS. Latin. Bibl. Nat., Paris, Cod. 3387, folios 214 verso-262; Little, o. c., 232.

⁷ No edition; Vatican Lib., Rome. MS. Latin. Palat. Cod. 679, pt. 1, fol. 117; Little, p. 232 ff.

⁸ Goldast, II. 313-391; Riezler, p. 250; Müller, II. 88.

⁹ Goldast, I. 21-24; Riezler, 254; Poole, *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, p. 359; Müller, o. c., II. p. 161. Some, on insufficient grounds, doubt the authenticity of this.

¹⁰ Goldast, II. 399-739; Riezler, 257.

¹¹ This is the usual though not the proper title. All that we have of this tract was published by Müller under the title of *Tractat gegen die Unterwerfungsformel Clemens VI.*, Giessen, 1888. Fragments published by C. Höfler in *Aus Avignon in Abhandl. d. königl. böhm. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. v. Jena*, for 1868; Prag, 1869.

¹² The *Disputatio inter Militem et Clericum*, so often attributed to Ockam, is now attributed by almost all authorities to Pierre Dubois, and is said to have been written in 1302. Dorner, however, in his *Das Verhältniss von Kirche u. Staat nach Occam in Theolog. Stud. u. Kritiken* for 1885, p. 677, still says, although on insufficient grounds, that it belongs to Ockam. The *Defensorium contra Errores Johannis* can no longer be ascribed to Ockam; Müller, *Zt. f. Kirchengesch.*, VI. 78-82.

in Paris before the writing of the *Defensor* and must there have exercised the influence on his ideas to which Clement refers.

Poole agrees with Riezler that Paris was the place where this influence must have been exercised, and on page 264 of his *Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought*¹ he goes on to say: "At that time" (hence 1312) "William of Ockam held undisputed supremacy over the minds of Parisian scholars, and it is natural to claim the English schoolman as one from whom Marsiglio derived more than the elements of his political, as of his metaphysical ideas." On page 276 he modifies this a little by adding that Marsiglio "went far ahead of his elder contemporary" and "Ockam in his turn fell strongly under the influence of the Italian speculator." On page 278, in a note, he makes a further modification when he says: "There is always a possibility that Marsiglio at an earlier time drew a good deal from Ockam; still the date of the *Defensor Pacis* furnishes a presumption of the former having a priority in his general conclusions." In his later work on Ockam² Poole is more decided. On page 357 he says: "Ockam exercised a strong influence upon Marsiglio's political speculations." A little further on he adds: "How far by this time Ockam had advanced in his political speculations need not be defined, though his influence on Marsiglio's *Defensor Pacis*, which was written while he was still at Paris, in 1324, can hardly be doubted."

Dorner³ and Marcour⁴ agree in general with these views. Müller is inclined to doubt. Silbernagl in an article in the *Historisches Jahrbuch* for 1896 on *Ockams Ansichten über Kirche und Staat* shows, against them all, that Marsiglio and Ockam have very little, if anything, in common in their ideas of church government and doctrine. In doing this Silbernagl is simply following the lead taken by Wadding⁵ and others in the first part of the seventeenth century to prove that Ockam did not write against the faith and authority of the Roman Catholic church, and therefore was not a heretic. But Silbernagl cannot break away from the old idea that Ockam influenced Marsiglio's political ideas. On page 431 (n. 2) he says, referring to the remarks of Clement VI.: "If Clement VI. in his speech says that Marsiglio and many others received their errors from Ockam, this can only refer to the political standing of the papacy and the relation between the pope and the emperor."

¹ London, 1884.

² *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, 1895.

³ O. c., p. 679, n. 1; p. 689, n. 5.

⁴ *Anteil der Minoriten am Kampfe zwischen Ludwig von Bayern u. Joh. XXII.*, Emmerich, 1874, p. 30.

⁵ *Annales Minorum*, edition by Fonseca, Rome, 1733, VII. 7, VIII. 13 ff.

Before turning to the examination of the foundation for the above statements, we may question some of the facts. There is absolutely no evidence to show that Ockam was the elder of Marsiglio, nor is there any record to show that he taught at Paris. Even if we accept the common tradition which makes him a teacher there, we have absolutely nothing to show us that he and Marsiglio were there at the same time. The supposed intimacy of Marsiglio with Ockam at Paris, or later at Munich, and the harmony which is said to have existed between Marsiglio and Jandum on the one side and the Minorites on the other are not supported by the evident anxiety which Cesena showed in declaring that he had never had anything to do with the heretic Jandum,¹ or by Ockam's clear implication in his *Epistola ad Fratres Minores* that he had never opposed the pope until 1328, and then only on theological and not on political grounds. It is very doubtful if Ockam would ever have opposed the pope had the question of evangelical poverty not been raised. Marsiglio's opposition, on the other hand, was purely political. It would have come whether the religious question had been raised or not. As it is, all the evidence that has been produced to show that Ockam influenced Marsiglio's ideas of church and state is the speech² of Clement VI., of July 11, 1343, directed against Louis of Bavaria and his supporter, William of Ockam. Here Clement says: "Hoc dicimus propter illum Wilhelmum Occam qui diversos errores contra potestatem et auctoritatem sancte sedis docuit et docet, et ab illo Guillelmo didicit et recepit errores ille Marsilius et multi alii."

The *errores* here referred to, which Marsiglio is accused of borrowing from Ockam, are only those made against the power and authority of the Holy See and have no reference whatever to Marsiglio's purely political ideas. The *errores*, however, may include his opinions on the church and on the relations between the church and the state. As Silbernagl has shown that Marsiglio did not borrow any of his errors on the church from Ockam, all that we need concern ourselves with here are their ideas on the relations between church and state. In this respect Marsiglio may have borrowed in any of his three works. We may at once put aside the *De Translatione Imperii*, because with few changes it is merely the *De Translatione Imperii* of Landulf of Colonna put into a new form. The same may be done with his tract on divorce. Marsiglio here shows himself more advanced than does Ockam in his tract on the same subject, although, as is natural, they have many ideas in common. If there were any borrowing, it is impossible to say which

¹ Preger, *Kirchenpolit. Kampf unter Ludwig*, Beilage I. p. 65.

² Printed in Höfler, o. c., p. 20.

one took his ideas from the other, because both wrote their tracts on this subject in the same year and it is not known which appeared first.¹ The elimination of these two works of Marsiglio leaves the *Defensor Pacis* as the only possible one in which the theories borrowed from Ockam may be found.

To find them it is necessary to compare the works of the two men. This comparison presents two great difficulties, the proximity of Marsiglio and the obscurity of Ockam. From the unnecessary profuseness of Marsiglio, however, we are able to draw well-defined theories of the state, of the church and of their relations to each other. From Ockam, on the other hand, it is at times almost impossible to have a clear idea of his true opinions. This comes, no doubt, from his wish to be non-committal. In the prologue to his *Dialogus* the scholar especially requests the master to give all possible answers to any question he may ask, but to indicate in no way that which is his, for fear that he may be prejudiced in favor of the opinion of his master.² The method outlined in this request is one that Ockam follows more or less closely in his most important works.³

Dealing primarily with the affairs of the church, Ockam does not, like Marsiglio, devote any considerable portion of his works to the theory of the state. For this it is necessary to search among his opinions on the church and on its relations to the state. According to him all people were originally in a state of nature⁴ and lived according to natural and divine law. Natural law⁵ is that which coincides with natural reason, that which may exist in an ideal state, such as community of goods, and that which is discovered as reasonable under certain conditions, such as the right to have one's property protected. Divine law is that which is revealed in the Scriptures. In a state of nature and according to natural law all men were free and all property was in common.⁶ But man fell from his state of innocence,⁷ and for the common good of all mor-

¹Müller, o.c., II. 161, on doubtful evidence takes the ground that Marsiglio wrote his tract on divorce before Ockam wrote his. As Marsiglio's was too bold Louis accepted Ockam's instead.

²Goldast, II. p. 398, line 20: "Peto enim . . .".

³Ibid.; *Ordo Quaestionum*, p. 314, l. 27, "Ea propter quia sequens . . ."; *Opus nonaginta Dierum*, p. 993, line 31, "Diligenter itaque . . .".

⁴*Dialogus*, Goldast, II. 932, l. 58, "statu naturae."

⁵Ibid., lines 53 ff. I hesitate to say that Ockam believed in the idea of equality, for fear "civil equality" might be understood. Here are his words: "Omnes homines natura sunt pares: puta in his, quae pertinent ad corporis sustentationem, et prolis generationem, sicut de matrimonio contrahendo, vel virginitate servanda, vel aliquo huiusmodi," *Dial.*, p. 893, l. 3; "homo homini obedire non tenetur, sed soli Deo," Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., "lapsus," and *Opus nonaginta Dierum*, p. 1144, l. 20, and p. 1073, lines 2 ff.

tals it was necessary to constitute the state.¹ This was done by a general compact of human society;² a prince was elected, and the members bound themselves to obey him in those things which were for the common good. As much liberty was left to the individual as was consistent with the common good of all.³ Thus he was not to be deprived of his life or of the liberty of his person.⁴

With the constitution of the state came the making of human or civil laws.⁵ By them was instituted the right of property,⁶ and the right of property once existing, the right to be secure in the possession of it naturally followed.⁷ The making of laws belongs to all mortals, for that which touches all must be acted on by all.⁸ They can, however, delegate this right to certain persons, such as the prince.⁹ In doing this they give him only such rights as they themselves have.¹⁰ If he oversteps the rights thus given, that is, if he does anything which is contrary to divine law or natural law, or the common good, men may refuse to obey.¹¹ If he tries to force them, the community may depose him¹² and the ordinary man may use his sword against him.¹³

The prince as representative of the people acts for the common good of all.¹⁴ Thus it is his duty to punish delinquents acting against the laws which are for the common well-being.¹⁵ He may also dispose of the property of another or collect taxes on it if this is for the common good.¹⁶ In the same interest, and acting for the community, he may appoint his own successor, but in the last instance this rests with the people.¹⁷ Since the state and its laws do

¹ *Octo Qu.*, p. 351, l. 39, and p. 352.

² "Generale pactum societatis humanæ," *Dial.*, p. 924, l. 60.

³ *Ibid.*, and *Octo Qu.*, p. 386, lines 5 ff.

⁴ *Dial.*, p. 932, l. 64.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 924, l. 18.

⁶ *Opus nonaginta Dierum*, p. 1143, l. 19 ff.; *Octo Qu.*, p. 386, l. 5 ff.

⁷ *Dial.*, p. 932.

⁸ "Quod omnes tangit debet tractari per omnes," *Ibid.*, 934, l. 15. Ockam borrows this from a commentary on the canon law; *Ibid.*, p. 604, l. 32 ff.; cf. A. Friedberg, *Corpus Juris Canonici*, Leipzig, 1879, I. 338, C. IV. This same principle is found in Bracton's *De Legibus* and in the summons of Edward I. to his bishops in 1295; cf. Stubbs, *Select Charters*, Oxford, 1874, p. 485, "quod omnes tangit ab omnibus approbetur."

⁹ *Dial.*, p. 934, l. 15 ff.

¹⁰ *Dial.*, p. 923, l. 25 ff.

¹¹ *Dial.*, p. 924, l. 50.

¹² P. 878, l. 45, and the general principle: "Omnis res per quascumque causas nascitur per easdem resolvitur." *Octo Qu.*, p. 341, l. 15.

¹³ *Octo Qu.*, p. 385, l. 28. Compare this with Aquinas *De Regimine Principum*.

¹⁴ *Dial.*, p. 902, l. 1 ff., p. 722, l. 17.

¹⁵ *Octo Qu.*, p. 351, l. 35.

¹⁶ *Dial.*, p. 920, l. 45, p. 921, l. 2.

¹⁷ *Octo Qu.*, p. 382.

not depend on belief, it is the duty of the prince to protect unbelievers as well as believers.¹

As to the form of government, Ockam prefers monarchy as that best able to keep peace in the world.² This monarchy should be elective,³ and if possible should be world-wide, for unity prevents sedition and discord.⁴ From this we can see that Ockam entertained the mediæval idea of the Empire. He saw that the "Universal Monarchy" did not exist, but he hoped that it would be realized, and believed at least that the imperial authority had been transferred legally to the Germans.⁵ The emperor who was elected by them, or rather by their representatives, the electoral princes,⁶ was head of the empire, as it used to exist under the Romans.⁷ If in actual fact France and the other countries did not seem to be a part of the empire, this was not because they refused to acknowledge it, but because the emperor was ignorant of his true rights or neglected to assert them.⁸ Thus the emperor was not doing his duty, for he should hold fast his sovereignty over all princes.⁹ The Roman Empire was established by the consent of all the people¹⁰ and it cannot be diminished or divided without the same consent.¹¹

In stating his theory of the state Ockam followed the Scriptures very closely. Marsiglio, on the other hand, almost wholly neglects them and draws the larger part of his ideas from Aristotle's *Politics*. The state according to Marsiglio is a complete community existing for the good of the people.¹² It had its origin in the union of man and woman. From this union came the family, from one family came many families, then the town and then many towns. In the family had grown up certain laws and customs. As the towns increased in number there arose relations between them, and the necessity of having somebody to look after them. In these communities one man ruled because there was no great number of learned men.¹³ But this man was no greater than the others, for one man can be prince and shepherd at the same time, like Abraham.¹⁴

¹ *Octo Qu.*, p. 325, p. 326.

² *Dial.*, p. 871. *Octo Qu.*, p. 350.

³ *Dial.*, pp. 871 ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Octo Qu.*, p. 366 ff. *Dial.*, p. 899 ff.

⁶ *Dial.*, pp. 899 ff.

⁷ *Ibid.* and *Octo Qu.*, p. 382, l. 30 ff.

⁸ *Dial.*, p. 908.

⁹ *Ibid.*, l. 41.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 902, l. 1 ff.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, l. 12.

¹² *Def. Pacis* in Goldast, II. 157, l. 45 ff.

¹³ *Ibid.*, l. 2 ff.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, l. 33.

The prince was put at the head through the act of election by the community of the people, and all the authority that he has he receives from them.¹ They as the supreme power in the state make all the laws.² If there is a dispute the majority rules.³ Minors, slaves, foreigners and women are not allowed to form a part of the assembly or lawmaking body. In this body every man has the right of proposing a law. If this proves impracticable the assembly may elect a body of wise men whose duty it shall be to prepare the laws and lay them before the assembly for its discussion and approval.⁴

The prince or governor, as representative of the community, is only the executive instrument of the lawgiving body.⁵ He must use his authority in ways prescribed by law and through officers chosen by the lawgiver. Thus a prince may have the general supervision over the number of people to be allowed to enter a certain class in the state, but it belongs to the lawgiver to decide what that number shall be, and what shall be the duties of the executive and of the judicial powers in a state.⁶ To enforce the laws and to see justice done the prince must have coercive power in the form of a small number of armed men. The number must be large enough to compel one or several citizens to do their duty, but yet not large enough to permit the prince to become despotic.⁷ If the prince oversteps his powers or disobeys the laws he can be punished and deposed by the lawgiver. Small offences must be passed over. At the same time the faults by which he is likely to render himself liable to deposition should be defined as thoroughly as possible.⁸

Marsiglio prefers monarchy to other forms of government, because under one ruling power peace is more likely to prevail than under several. Of the different kinds of monarchies he prefers the elective monarchy, because the reason why one should be prince is not relationship to his predecessor (through which there is a similarity of body rather than mind), but a perfect character.⁹ Of the efficacy of a universal monarchy he is in doubt,¹⁰ though he shows elsewhere that he had the common conception of the translation of the Empire from the Romans to the Germans.¹¹

Marsiglio has a well-defined idea of toleration for, according to him, no one, not even a believer, much less an unbeliever, can be compelled by the church to follow the precepts of evangelical law.¹²

¹ P. 175, l. 32.

² P. 169, l. 56.

³ Ibid., ff.

⁴ Pp. 171-173, l. 10.

⁵ P. 175, l. 63.

⁶ Pp. 176, 177; p. 167, l. 25.

⁷ P. 174, l. 45 ff.

⁸ P. 185, l. 20 ff.

⁹ P. 182, l. 17 ff.

¹⁰ P. 184, l. 12 ff.

¹¹ *De Translatione Imperii*.

¹² P. 213, l. 45; p. 217, l. 33.

Marsiglio's idea of toleration differs from Ockam's, inasmuch as it not only suggests protection to both unbelievers and believers, but also disapproves and prohibits the punishment of heretics, unless heresy is against the laws of the state. He does not say that the state ought not to make laws against heresy, although he implies it. But it is unnecessary to state the differences between the theories of Ockam and those of Marsiglio. It will easily be seen that they have almost nothing in common. Ockam had no clear idea of toleration. His theory of the right of revolution, which is very similar to that of Aquinas, makes every man his own judge in regard to the wrong-doings of the prince, and thus makes the existence of the state precarious. The only ideas which the two men had in common were those concerning the Empire. Marsiglio drew his theories on this subject from Landulf of Colonna, while Ockam seems to have followed very closely the *De Monarchia* of Dante. Marsiglio, like Ockam, believed in the fiction which made the electoral princes representatives of the people.¹

In their ideas of the church, as in those of the state, the two men had very little in common, as Silbernagl has well proved. The same may be said in regard to their theories on the relations of church and state. About these two institutions Ockam adopts a theory similar to that of Dante. The two bodies exist side by side, each doing good for the community in its own proper sphere. Religion in itself is higher than mere earthly things² and in this respect the state and church may be compared to body and soul, the pope and the emperor to the sun and the moon,³ or to father and son.⁴ Each has relations to the other, but each must be given its own proper functions. The emperor is supreme in temporal affairs and the pope in spiritual, and as a general rule neither must interfere with the other. In exceptional cases, however, each may interfere in the domain of the other. This is because both are representatives of the people and each may see to it that the other is doing his duty towards the common weal.⁵

Thus the emperor may interfere in and carry out the election of the pope if the cardinals are heretical.⁶ To do this, however, the emperor must be a Christian and Catholic prince and not himself a heretic.⁷ If the pope is guilty of heresy, and remains incorrigible

¹ *Def. Pacis*, p. 282, l. 50; p. 281, l. 58.

² *Dial.*, p. 893, l. 58. *Octo Qu.* p. 331, ll. 10-20.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Octo Qu.*, p. 344, l. 43 ff.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Dial.*, p. 955, l. 24 ff.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 931, l. 30 ff. and p. 932.

and refuses to permit an inquisition of his opinions to be held, and if in such a case the ecclesiastical authority refuses to take action, the emperor, be he heretic or not, may depose him.¹ For a Christian prince should look after the spiritual welfare of his people,² but even an unbelieving prince may interfere in ecclesiastical affairs in so far as they touch the well-being of the state.³ In accordance with this same principle the pope, like any other ecclesiastic, must undergo trial before a secular court if he commits a temporal crime.⁴ All worldly affairs of spiritual persons come properly before the temporal judge.⁵ Thus disputes between laymen and clerks must be decided in lay courts. The lands and property of the church, inasmuch as they are temporalities, can be taxed by the state and must also be protected by the state.⁶ Gifts, therefore, which are made to the church do not pass from under state supervision, for the emperor has the right to tax them and to see that the intentions of the giver are carried out.⁷ If the pope or the clergy offer any resistance to the interference of the emperor or the state in those affairs of the church in which they are justly entitled to interfere, force may be employed against them.⁸

Likewise the pope in numerous cases may interfere with the emperor and the affairs of the state. If there is a vacancy in the imperial succession, the pope as representative of the Romans may act as vicar, if there is no one else to do so.⁹ In the election of emperor the pope has nothing to say, but he may go through the mere ceremony of anointing and crowning him.¹⁰ If the emperor or his officers do not give justice in temporal affairs, and no one else can or will force them, the pope in his capacity of a citizen and as representative of the people may interfere in the temporal courts and may depose the unjust emperor.¹¹ If temporal laws and customs are against the well-being of believers, the pope can set them aside.¹² He may also relieve the vassals of the emperor from their oaths, if he can show good reasons why they should keep them no longer.¹³ His

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 557, l. 55 ff.; pp. 558, 559 and 561, l. 5 ff.; p. 626, l. 50 ff.

² *Octo Qu.*, p. 354, l. 6.

³ *Dial.*, p. 893, l. 58 ff.

⁴ *Octo Qu.*, pp. 332, 333, l. 26 ff.

⁵ *Dial.*, pp. 511, 887, 956.

⁶ *Octo Qu.*, p. 343, l. 58 ff.; p. 347, l. 60 ff.; *Dial.*, p. 901, line 1 ff.

⁷ *Octo Qu.*, p. 343, l. 58 ff.

⁸ *Dial.*, p. 558.

⁹ *Octo Qu.*, p. 344, l. 62.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 365, l. 50 ff.; p. 370, l. 17 ff. *Dial.*, p. 925, l. 50 ff.

¹¹ *Octo Qu.*, p. 327, l. 40; p. 328, l. 40 ff. *Dial.*, p. 908, l. 31 ff.

¹² *Octo Qu.*, pp. 347, 356.

¹³ *Dial.*, p. 890.

interference in temporal matters, however, must not be by force of arms, but by teaching and instruction.¹

The pope and the emperor must each be careful not to overstep their rights in interfering in the domain of the other. Because the pope may have had, and may receive by delegation from the people, the right of electing the emperor on one occasion, he must not think that he is always to have the right.² As a priest he must exhort men to obedience, but he must not try to force them.³ So the prince, who has control over marriage as a partly human institution, must not forget that it is necessary to conform with divine law in this regard.⁴ Though he may interfere in church matters as far as they touch temporal interests, he must remember that he has no rights over purely divine institutions such as ordination,⁵ and that in spiritual things he owes obedience to the pope.⁶

Ockam's ideas on the relations of church and state become clear if we regard the whole of society as forming two different institutions at different times. To deal with purely earthly matters the whole society becomes a lawgiving body which elects its officers and is what is ordinarily called the state. To deal with spiritual matters the same society becomes a congregation of the faithful, the men who have been officers of the state drop back to their positions of ordinary members of the congregation, and new officers are elected to guide society in its capacity as the church. When society turns to deal with temporal affairs again, the old officers assume power and the officers of society acting as the church return to their positions as subjects and citizens.

Wholly different from this was Marsiglio's idea of church and state. The supreme institution in the world according to him is the state. The state has for itself two duties, one to care for man's well-being in this world, the other to care for his well-being in the next.⁷ For the purpose of fulfilling this latter duty the state constituted the class of priests in the same manner that it had constituted the other classes, such as the builders, handiworkers and others.⁸ As it can regulate and decide on the number and organization of these⁹ classes, so it can determine the number of priests and prescribe the laws for the organization of the priesthood.¹⁰

¹ *Dial.*, p. 914, l. 18 ff.

³ *Octo Qu.*, p. 349.

² *Dial.*, p. 902, l. 47 ff.

⁴ *Dial.*, p. 915, l. 30.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 929, l. 54 ff.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 887-888 and p. 893, l. 58 ff.

⁷ *Def. Pacis*, p. 158 (wrongly printed 168), l. 23 ff.

⁸ *Ibid.*, l. 45 ff.; p. 160, l. 3 ff.; p. 238, l. 43 ff.

⁹ P. 177, 12 ff.; p. 213, l. 2.

¹⁰ P. 249, l. 58 ff.

All priests are equal in power.¹ For reasons of unity and convenience in church organization it may be useful to have one man at the head, such as the pope, with the others under him.² But the pope and the bishop have power over the ordinary priest only by virtue of gift from the temporal lawgiver, or its representative, the prince.³ What the lawgiver has granted, he may also strictly control and may even take away.⁴ Thus the legislator shall decide whether a man is qualified for the office of a churchman or not, and what the mode of election and installation of bishops shall be.⁵ No bishop, priest or college of priests can come to any church living or office without the consent of the lawgiver or its representative, the prince.⁶ To the same body or person belongs the right of urging a priest to his duty,⁷ and in case of necessity, of depriving him of his office.⁸

The priesthood so constituted and regulated must teach men the Gospel so as to lead them to future life.⁹ In cases of doubt as to the meaning of the Gospel, it is the duty of the lawgiver, or its representative, the prince, to call a general council of all the faithful, or their plenipotentiaries, to decide on the disputed point.¹⁰ The council shall consist of laity as well as clergy, and the prince as representative of the lawgiver shall preside and shall punish the transgressors of its decisions, in so far of course as these transgressions are against temporal law.¹¹ For not every one who sins against divine laws can be punished by the temporal judge, because very often that which is wrong according to heavenly laws is not against the earthly laws.¹² In common with the lawgiver the general council exercises control over the excommunication of laymen and clergymen and over the administration of church property.¹³ If a chief head of the church exists it will be his duty to inform the lawgiver when it is necessary to call a general council. He must then preside at the meetings instead of the prince, must publish the decisions, and must punish transgressors with spiritual censure, but further than this he has no

¹ P. 241, l. 36.

² P. 264, l. 39.

³ P. 263, l. 59.

⁴ P. 204, l. 44.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ P. 261, l. 60 ff.

¹⁰ P. 261, l. 30. Marsiglio and Ockam agree in general on the council of the faithful. Both give representation to the laity—Ockam even to women. Marsiglio makes it more largely a secular institution than Ockam, because he puts the initiative with the prince. Compare with *Dial.*, pp. 604, 605.

¹¹ P. 258, l. 55; p. 256, l. 55; p. 253.

¹² P. 217, l. 33 ff.

¹³ P. 261, l. 11 ff., l. 40 ff.

⁵ P. 249, l. 53; p. 250, l. 5.

⁶ P. 251, l. 2, ff.

⁷ P. 248, l. 25.

right to go.¹ If he does so, the state or its representative, the prince, or a general council may depose him.²

Marsiglio recognizes no rights of the clergy over the prince. The very nature of the priestly office prevents spiritual persons from interfering in temporal affairs. The pope has absolutely no voice in the election of the prince or emperor.³ Ecclesiastics are subject to the coercive power of the state,⁴ but they can exercise no such power themselves.⁵ No priest or bishop can ever absolve a subject from his oath of allegiance.⁶ If a prince is despotic and tyrannical, it belongs to the laity and not to the clergy to correct him.

Though Marsiglio's theories on the church and the state seem entirely contrary to the histories of those two institutions, he readily believed that his ideas agreed with the facts. With the purpose of showing their agreement he devoted a considerable portion of his work to tracing the origin and history of the church.⁷ As regards the state, he must have seen that, as it existed when he wrote, it was nowise like his ideas of it, and yet he tried to harmonize the Empire of the Middle Ages with his theories of the state.

He has been accused, and justly, of using Aristotle too freely. As an Italian Marsiglio was more or less familiar with the city republics of his country, and it was natural to adopt Aristotle's idea of the city-state. It was in the application of Aristotle's theories to the conditions of the mediæval church and state that Marsiglio's originality lay. As Riezler very happily puts it: "On borrowed foundations he erected a new structure."

As Marsiglio borrowed from Aristotle, so Ockam borrowed from the Bible. The Middle Ages were not noted for originality of conception, and neither of these men was an exception to the rule. Taking their ideas from different sources, however, their theories of church and state are totally different. It cannot be denied that in many minor points, such as the control over excommunication, they are in agreement.⁸ In the essential, in the foundations of their theories, they are opposed. It is thus with their ideas of the origin of

¹ P. 264, l. 39.

³ P. 282.

² Ibid. and p. 312, l. 30.

⁴ P. 211.

⁵ P. 217, 242. It is hardly surprising that L. E. Du Pin, in his *Hist. Eccles.*, Paris, 1726, *sub anno* 1328, thinks that Marsiglio was right in attacking the corruptions of the church, but went altogether too far.

⁶ P. 285.

⁷ Book II., chapters 18, 22, 25.

⁸ *Def. Pacis*, p. 261, l. 11. *Dial.*, p. 484, l. 40 ff. Numerous minor points could be mentioned on which they are in agreement, such as the taxation of Church property, the constitution and powers of a general council, etc. Many could also be shown in which they disagreed, such as the determination of the number of priests allowed to enter the priesthood, the power over the oaths of allegiance, etc. Such cases of agreement are inevitable. It has been our object here to bring out only the important points.

the state, of the right to depose the prince, and of the right of the head of the church to interfere in the government of the state. So entirely opposed are the theories of the two men, so totally different are their conceptions of the church and the state that it is difficult to see on what grounds Clement VI. accused Marsiglio of borrowing from Ockam. An accusation made with so little foundation is open to suspicion and leads us to question not only the authority of Clement, but also the nature of the speech in which the accusation is contained.

When Clement made his speech of July 11, 1343, Marsiglio was already dead. As he was desirous of making his charges against Ockam as strong as possible, nothing was more natural than that he, regardless of the truth of the matter, should make Ockam responsible for the errors of the "worst of heretics."¹ After the same manner and with just as little foundation, Gregory XI. accused Wiclif of borrowing his heretical ideas from Marsiglio,² and Albert Pighio accused Luther of doing the same.³ Pighio, looking on Marsiglio as the representative of direst heresy, accused him of having a companion in the person of Ockam.⁴ In addition to this we have a bull of January 21, 1331,⁵ by John XXII. in direct conflict with the words of his successor Clement. Here John accuses the Minorites, among whom Raynaldus puts Cesena, Ockam and Bonagratia, of borrowing the heresies of Marsiglio, which had already been condemned by a bull of October 23, 1327.⁶ Among these borrowed heresies is the opinion that "the emperor can depose the pope," of which Cesena, Ockam and others were accused in a bull of January 4, 1331.⁷ In face of such contradictory evidence Clement's statement is of very little value.⁸

JAMES SULLIVAN.

(To be continued.)

¹ Speech of April 10, 1343, in Höfler, o. c., p. 20.

² Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana*, I. 345 ff., edition of 1863, Rolls Series. Rashdall, *Universities in the Middle Ages*, 1895, II. 540, n. i., says these were Ockam's theories which Gregory condemned because Marsiglio and Jandum were Ockam's disciples." (?)

³ *Hierarchie ecclesiasticæ Assertio*, fol. 239 v^o, ed. 1544, Cologne, and p. 4 of the *Epistola Nuncupatoria*.

⁴ Ibid., fol. 301.

⁵ Raynaldus, *Annales Eccles.*, ed. Mansi, Lucca, 1750, V. 24, *sub anno* 1331, §§ I., II.

⁶ Martène et Durand, o. c., II. 704.

⁷ Martène et Durand, o. c., II. 828.

⁸ Articles on Ockam in the *Amer. Church Rev.*, 1873, and on "Ockam and the English Reformation" in the *British Quarterly Rev.*, 1872, I have been unable to consult.